



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/654,949	09/01/2000	Peter Brittingham	ETS-TCA	7078
21269	7590	05/01/2007	EXAMINER	
PEPPER HAMILTON LLP			WILLIAMS, ROSS A	
ONE MELLON CENTER, 50TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
500 GRANT STREET			3714	
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219				

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/654,949	BRITTINGHAM ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Ross A. Williams	3714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/18/06.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 - 5, 13 - 17, 19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1 - 5, 13 - 17, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claims 1 – 5, 13 – 17, 19 and 20 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 13-16, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sweitzer et al. (US 6,018,617).

1. [Claims 1,5,14]: Regarding Claims 1,5, and 14, Sweitzer discloses obtaining a test item (i.e., problem). See Abstract. Sweitzer discloses creating a test model by identifying elements of the test item to be variabilized and variabilizing the elements to create variables in Col.12: 34-37:

The variation rules may assign substitution variables (variables used in the problem layout) or temporary variables (variables used only within the variation rules).

Sweitzer discloses defining the variables in Col.12: 49-50:

Substitution variables are defined using the variation rule syntax, which is not case sensitive.

Sweitzer discloses generating a test item variant (i.e., instance of a problem) of the test item by assigning values to the variables using a simultaneous constraint solver, wherein the simultaneous constraint solver resolves one or more constraints pertaining to variables in Col.12: 41-46:

To produce an instance of a problem 32, the list of variation rules is evaluated sequentially from top to bottom. If a constraint is not satisfied, the current pass through the list is abandoned and evaluation restarts from the top of the list. A valid instance of the problem results when the end of the variation rule list is reached.

2. [Claims 2,15]: Regarding Claims 2 and 15, Sweitzer discloses wherein said model creation further comprises specifying constraints that define a relationship among the variables in Col.12: 50-53:

This language supports basic mathematical operations, **relational** comparisons, and logical combinations using general expressions and operator rotation. Function (procedure) references provide extended capabilities.

3. [Claims 3-4,13,16]: Regarding Claims 3-4,13, and 16, Sweitzer discloses the step of accepting and retrievably storing the test item variant and the test item model (i.e., instance of a generalized problem) in Col.11: 57-63 and Col.12: 24-27, 45-46:

As was discussed above, problem content is created by an author who is typically a professional programmer; but may be the end user of the test operating software running on the personal computer 13. The content of the problem is expressed in machine-usable form using the authoring tool 30, which stores each problem 32 in a separate file on disk. Problems 32 are organized for easy retrieval in a single disk file, i.e. one or more problem books 34. The set of programs that support collecting problems 32 into the problem books 34 is referred to as the build tools 70.

Art Unit: 3714

(31) Each problem 32 is described by a few key parameters. These parameters assist the user in selecting problems 32 to include in a worksheet 50. Problems 32 within each problem book 34 are grouped into objectives. Objectives are grouped into sections and sections are grouped into chapters. Problems are not necessarily self-contained. They may refer to external objects, which are included in the representation at print time. Multiple problems can include the same external object. These objects are stored within the problem book 34 file.

The authoring tool 30 and print engine 90, discussed in greater detail below, use variation rules which are stored in the variation rules module or engine 80 (FIG. 8) and define instances of a generalized problem.

A valid instance of the problem results when the end of the variation rule list is reached.

4. [Claim 19]: Regarding Claim 19, Sweitzer discloses wherein variables can be defined by values which are variables (e.g., mathematical expressions) in Col.12: 30-32:

Variables may be replaced with numbers, text, graphics, or mathematical expressions.

5. [Claim 20]: Regarding Claim 20, Sweitzer discloses wherein the variables are new variables (e.g., substitution variables, temporary variables) for which new constraints are defined as needed in Col.12: 34-38:

The variation rules for a problem 30 are an ordered list of definitions and constraints expressed in a simple language. The variation rules may assign substitution variables (variables used in the problem layout) or temporary variables (variables used only within the variation rules). The variation rules may also impose constraints on the relationship between variables.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweitzer.

Sweitzer does not disclose expressly wherein the test item model constraints are simultaneously solved using PROLOG IV and Test Creation Assistant constraint language. Instead, Sweitzer discloses the use of C++ in Col.6: 28-39 and variation rules language to simultaneously solve test item model constraints in Col.10: 61-63.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use C++ and variation rules language to simultaneously solve test item model constraints because Applicant has not disclosed that using PROLOG IV and Test Creation Assistant constraint language, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Sweitzer's invention, and applicant's invention, to perform equally well with either the languages taught by Sweitzer or the languages claimed by Applicant because both languages would perform the same function of generating multiple instances of a test item.

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to modify Sweitzer to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17 because such a modification would have

been considered a mere design consideration which fails to patentably distinguish over the prior art of Sweitzer.

Response to Arguments

The Applicant argues that Sweitzer does not disclose a “simultaneous constraint solver” as required by the claims. Specifically the Applicant states that “In contrast, claim 1 requires a simultaneous constraint solver to generate test item variants. A simultaneous constraint solver solves for all constraints simultaneously. In other words, a simultaneous constraint solver merely requires determining values for a set of constraints once to generate a test item variant. As a result test items are generated more efficiently.” As such Sweitzer, unlike the simultaneous constraint solver of claim 1, typically requires evaluating multiple constraints a plurality of times until all the constraints of the sequence are satisfied. Accordingly, Sweitzer does not disclose “generating a test item variant of the test item by assigning values to the variables using a simultaneous constraint solver” as required by claim 1” (Applicant Remarks 12/18/06 pages 5,6).

The Examiner disagrees. The Examiner points out that although Sweitzer discloses constraint solver that evaluates constraints sequentially, the claims are not patentably distinguished over the disclosure of Sweitzer. For instance, in the process of evaluating the constraints of Sweitzer on one single pass wherein upon the first pass the variation rules that are applied and solved for are satisfied then multiple sequential evaluation passes would then be rendered unnecessary and would not be executed.

It should also be noted that the claims do not specifically require that multiple constraints be solved simultaneously or at the same time. For example in claims one all that is required is a "simultaneous constraint solver that resolves *one* constraint that pertains to the variables. As discussed above Sweitzer specifically discloses that step or function.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ross A. Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-5911. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


RAW
4/10/07


Robert E. Pezzuto
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3714